UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,191	06/04/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10007667-1	5616

7590   03/09/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO   80527-2400

EXAMINER
TUCKER, WESLEY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/874,191	SIMPSON ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Wes Tucker	2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _08 December 2005_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-10 and 12-23_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-10 and 12-23_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _04 June 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments and Amendments

1.   The amendment filed December 8th 2005 has been entered and made of record.

2.   Applicant has amended claim 12. Claims 11 and 20 were previously canceled. Claims 1-10, 12-19 and 21-23 are pending.

3.   Applicant's remarks with regard to the currently pending independent claims have been entered and fully considered but are not persuasive for at least the following reasons:

4.   Applicant has submitted an extensive list of remarks, 17 pages to be exact. In response to these remarks another rejection is hereby presented. Acoordingly, many of the remarks are deemed moot in view of the new rejection. However Examiner has made every attempt to spell out and explain how each limitation of the presently claimed invention is met by the references. Preliminary response to the repeated concerns of the Applicant are addressed below and thereafter the rejection is presented with further explanations.

With Regard to Firmware Residing Inside or Outside the Scanner

5.   Applicant argues that the combination and motivation of combination of Ogawa and Melen is improper to teach that a CPU capable of controlling data routing and transfer may reasonably reside within a scanner.

Without going any further it should be pointed out that the scanner of Ogawa inherently contains such firmware and a rejection under 35 USC 102 is also presented below. See Ogawa Fig. 7 and column 6, lines 23-28.

With regard to claim 103, the reference of Melen was cited to teach that the practice of scanning and routing image data may be performed using firmware, software or hardware and that a CPU for performing such functions may reside either within a scanner or outside a scanner (column 2, lines 38-50). The motivation to combine Melen with Ogawa is firstly that Melen discloses that the CPU may reside either within or outside teaching that the functions performed are not affected by the location. Furthermore having the CPU within the scanner instead of outside the scanner is obvious for many reasons such as reducing latency in the processing between the processor and scanner by being a part of the same unit as well as the reduction in separate entities from having the controlling processor as a separate entity to having them embodied in one machine.

It seems that the citation of Melen was unnecessary as Ogawa's scanner contains firmware capable of performing all the claimed functions. See Fig. 7 and

column 6, lines 25-30. Ogawa discloses various input output operations inherently

being performed with firmware.

With Regard to "Link References"

6.   The Link Reference argument will now be addressed. Examiner clearly

stated why the user ID and the way in which the user ID points to the file directories in

Ogawa is interpreted as a link reference in the Final Office Action filed April 2005 and

that discussion has been included below for the record and for Applicant's convenience.

Examiner will explain it yet again in more detailed terms.

Firstly, the term link reference never appears in the specification and has not

been expressly defined by Applicant.

Applicant defines Hyperlink on page 5 of the specification as: *a navigational link*

from one document to another, from one portion (or component) of a document to

another or to a Web resource, such as a Java applet. Typically a hyperlink is displayed

as a highlighted word or phrase that can be selected by clicking on it using a mouse ***to***

jump to the associated document or document portion or to retrieve a particular

resource (emphasis added).

Now Hyperlinks in general jump the user from one web resource to another, this

is generally done through the use of a URL or Uniform Resource Locator, which

applicant has also defined in the specification as *a unique address which fully specifies*

the location of a file or other resources on the internet or a network. The general format

of a URL is protocol: //machine address:port/path/filename.

So it appears that a hyperlink which examiner is interpreting to be very similar to a "link reference" since that is the only "link" defined in the specification is essentially a way for a computer to jump or navigate through file directories or databases or data structures or however data is stored in digital form to an associated document to retrieve a particular resource. URLs in essence point to a location of a file directory. This is exactly what is performed in Ogawa. A user ID is used *"and a memory means in which relationships of correspondence between identification on users and the directories associated with the users are stored."* (column 2, lines 35-39). It is this storing of correspondence between the user Id and the associated data that is interpreted as a link reference. This link reference or correspondence between the user ID and the users associated file directory enables the storage of image data in the file directory and it should also be clear that these links are stored so that data may be later retrieved. This should be exceedingly clear. Indeed it is difficult to see how this would not be considered a link reference.

However Applicant insists (in remarks on page 11): *"The Examiner interprets the user Ids of Ogawa as the claimed link references. User IDs are well known in the art and link references are well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would not equate a user ID with a link reference and Ogawa provides no suggestion or motivation otherwise. Furthermore, the Examiner's interpretation is not consistent with the present specification or the claims. Therefore, the Examiner's interpretation is not supported by the teachings of the art. For at*

least this reason, Ogawa fails to teach or suggest the "storing" limitation of claim 12."

In response to these arguments, one of ordinary skill in the art would most certainly equate a user Id with a link reference when *"a memory means in which the relationships of correspondence between identification on users and the directories associated with the users are stored"* (Ogawa, column 2, lines 35-40).

It is difficult to tell whether or not Examiners interpretation is consistent with the present specification or the claims when the term "link reference" only appears in the claims and does not appear once in the specification. Furthermore Applicant makes no attempt at explaining what Applicant views as the principle differences are between the claimed "link references" and the User ID file pointers of Ogawa. Applicant simply states they are not the same with no explanation. It should be clear that the user IDs and their relationships of correspondence to the associated directories clearly reads on the term "link reference."

Applicant goes on to argue (page 11 of remarks) that: *"Additionally, is user IDs are interpreted as link references (which they cannot be), Ogawa still fails to teach a scanner configured to store user IDs in a composition store."*

In response to this argument Examiner points once again to the cited passage of Ogawa wherein *"A MEMORY MEANS in which the relationships of correspondence between identification on users and the directories associated with the users ARE STORED"* (Ogawa, column 2, lines 35-40).

When the scanner in Ogawa obtains user information, the invention knows exactly where to place the scanned images in the directory associated with that user on the network. This is known because stored in memory along with each user ID tag is the file directory where the images are to be stored. Furthermore the system knows how to get to the directory because with the directory name is the file within a file or path name in a format typical of data storage such as:

//machineaddress:port/pathdirectory/user/filename. **This is interpreted as a "link reference" to the users directory stored with each user ID. This is how the scanner and netwoeked sytem know where to put the scanned image scanned by a user.**

It should be abundantly clear now how the Examiner interprets the User IDs of Ogawa and how the correspondence stored between those IDs and the respective directories constitute link references.

7.   Text from the Final Office Action filed April 2005 presented for applicant's convenience:

> *The term "link reference" is not used in the specification, but as far the Examiner can tell it refers to the way the images are routed or located. This is interpreted to be equivalent to the way they are routed or located in Ogawa, by their user ID and specified directory. Applicant further points out that these "link references" allow remote web services to locate imaging data associated with a particular user by accessing the centralized*

data store. Examiner points out that this is exactly the purpose of the user

IDs used in Ogawa. A user ID is used to associate an image with a user or

directory, and data is then accessed according to accessing the directory

with that information just like all computer data access operations.

Applicant argues that the one-to-one correspondence of directories

does not consider a centralized data store as recited in claim 1, because

Ogawa does not have a need to track a user's image data that may be

stored in multiple locations, or even multiple remote devices. Examiner

submits that the index of images taught by Ogawa is the same thing as the

centralized data store as recited in claim 1. The use of pointers or links to

databases is well known in the art and is an inherent part of storing data in

computer memory especially in the use of web applications and servers.

The ID used to identify each user's file server is interpreted the same as a

link that is used for allowing remote access by web services.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8.   Claims 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

U.S. Patent 6,115,739 to Ogawa et al.

With regard to claim 12, Ogawa discloses a method for transferring scanned

imaging data from a scanning device to a personal imaging repository having one or

more imaging data stores for storing the imaging data of a user and a composition store

for storing imaging compositions having links to the imaging data, said method

comprising:

Ogawa further discloses receiving the scanned imaging data (Fig. 2, element 12,

column 2, lines 28-31).

Ogawa further discloses obtaining by the scanning device user information

relating to the personal imaging repository that identifies an imaging data store and a

composition store associated to the user (column 2, lines 30-40). Here Ogawa

discloses that the scanner contains **"input means for inputting identification**

information on a user." Ogawa also discloses **"a memory means in which the**

relationships of correspondence between identification information on users and

the directories associated with the users are stored." The directories with

correspondence identification to the users are interpreted as a composition store

associated with to the user.

Ogawa further discloses connecting by the image scanning device with the

imaging store of the personal imaging repository indicated from the user information

(column 2, lines 34-42). Here Ogawa discloses a file server that stores the data in a

directory associated with the user identification information input by the user. The

connecting is interpreted as being performed by the scanning device (column 2, line 29

and Fig. 7 and column 6, lines 25-29). Here Ogawa discloses where the image scanner

inputs the data and establishes connection with the network.

Applicant previously made the argument (remarks page 11) that because the

Ogawa discloses "...said file server stores the image data in a directory..."(see column

2, lines 39-40), that the scanning device does not store the image data as claimed.

Ogawa discloses that "the image data is input from the scanner" (column 2, lines 39-

40). Applicant is advised that this is how networks work. They use servers. Applicants

network depicted in Fig.1 uses a server. If image data goes through a communication

link it must use a server. In networked applications there is always a client and a

server. Applicant is pointed to the specification on page 4 of the disclosure at the

definition of Client-Server. In Applicant's Fig. 1, if the client is the imaging client 12,

then there must be server. The Sever can be the Web Service Site 36 or it can be

within the Communication Link 16 or it can even be the Scanning Device 14. The

Server can play any of these roles, but let it be known that a Server is inherent to any

networked operation. Therefore when Ogawa inputs the image data from the scanner

and stores it by transferring through the server, this clearly reads on having the scanner

store the data in a networked environment like the one claimed.

Ogawa further discloses transferring by the image scanning device the scanned

imaging data to the imaging data store (column 2, lines 34-40). Again the discussion

above applies. When Ogawa discloses that the image data is sent via the scanner to a

server and to an image file directory this is interpreted as transferring by the image-scanning device.

Storing by the image scanning device, in the composition data store associated to the user, a link reference that identifies a location of the scanned imaging data where the composition store maintains a plurality of link references to a plurality of imaging data that may be stored in separate imaging data stores (column 2, lines 34-42 and Fig. 1 and Fig. 7 and column 6, lines 25-30). The plurality of link references to a plurality of imaging data that may be stored in separate imaging stores is interpreted as the user IDs that identify correspondence information with the user's directory and multiple imaging stores are the memories allocated to store the images. Again the discussion presented above with regard to the "storing by the scanning device." When Ogawa discloses that the image data is input by the scanning device and directed to storage in the server this is interpreted as "storing by the scanner device."

The user IDs and their correspondence to their respective user directories should be understood as link references from the discussion presented at the beginning of this office action.

With regard to claim 13, Ogawa discloses the method according to claim 12 further comprising the steps of: obtaining the link reference of the scanned image data stored in the imaging data store (column 2, lines 35-42, Figs 4 and 5). Here the image

file storage system is disclosed. The image files all have indexes and are considered to

operate as link references. See discussion above regarding "link references."

Ogawa further discloses disconnecting from the imaging data store by the

scanning device (column 2, lines 45-54). Here the file server is disconnected from the

scanner.

With regard to claim 14, Ogawa discloses the method of claim 12 wherein said

step of connecting with the imaging data store further comprising the steps of:

determining whether the connection with the imaging data store is successful

(column 2, lines 50-54);

returning an error message to the user when the connection is not successful

(column 2, lines 50-54); and,

converting the scanned imaging data into a predefined format (column 2, lines

65-68 and Fig. 11). Here the image is stored in .JBG and .TIF formats. The image can

be stored in one standard format and then converted to another (column 9, lines 45-60).

With regard to claim 15, Ogawa discloses the method according to claim 14

wherein said predefined format is any from the group consisting of: JPEG, GIF, PNGF,

TIF, PDF, and Microsoft Windows bitmap format (Fig. 11). Here two image file formats

are given as IMAGE.TIF and IMAGE.JBG.

With regard to claim 16, Ogawa discloses the method according to claim 12 where the storing comprising the step of obtaining a link reference of the scanned imaging data stored in the imaging data store (Figs. 4 and 5). All of the images in the image database have indexes and the file path corresponding to the user indexed directory are interpreted as link references.

Ogawa further discloses connecting with the composition store of the personal imaging repository indicated from the user information (column 2, lines 30-40).

Ogawa further discloses creating an imaging composition having the link reference to the scanned imaging data stored in the personal imaging data store (column 2, lines 30-40).

Ogawa further discloses saving the imaging composition to the composition store (column 2, lines 30-40).

With regard to claim 17, Ogawa discloses the method according to claim 16 further comprising the steps of: setting the imaging composition as a selected composition available for service in the composition store (column 2, lines 30-40); and disconnecting from the composition store of the personal imaging repository (column 2, lines 45-54).

With regard to claim 18, Ogawa discloses the method according to claim 16 wherein prior to the step of creating an imaging composition further comprising the steps of: determining whether the connection with the composition store is successful;

and, returning an error message to the user when the connection to the composition is

not successful (column 2, lines 45-54). Here Ogawa discloses when the connection to

the file server or image store is lost or disconnected, the user is notified.

With regard to claim 19, Ogawa discloses the method according to claim 16

wherein said step of creating an imaging composition further comprising the step of

adding the link reference of the imaging data stored in the imaging data store to the

imaging composition (Figs. 4 and 5). Here the directory is considered to be the image

directory in which each image added to the file server is indexed or referred to with a

link or index number.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 1-9 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over the combination U.S. Patent 6,115,739 to Ogawa and U.S. Patent

6,930,709 to Creamer et al.

With regard to claim 1, Ogawa discloses a system for transferring scanned imaging data from a scanning device to a personal imaging repository (abstract).

Ogawa further discloses a scanning device capable of scanning imaging data (Fig. 2, element 12, column 2, lines 28-31).

Ogawa further discloses the scanning device configured to obtain user information relating to a personal imaging repository associated with a particular user for storing data that is to be accessed by remote web services (column 2, lines 31-37). Here identification information about the user is used to direct scanned images to the corresponding directories over a network. With regard to "storing imaging data that is to be accessed by remote web services," it should be understood that Ogawa discloses a networked system (column 2, lines 20-23) and that the very purpose of any network system is the access to information remotely. Therefore it is interpreted that the imaging data store is available to remote services, the first of which is the imaging data store being available to receive more scanned images. The scanner itself is accessing the file directory and this is interpreted in the networked environment as "imaging data that is to be accessed by remote web services.

Ogawa further discloses a device firmware being part of the scanning device for storing scanned imaging data from the scanning device into said personal imaging repository (column 2, lines 28-32) and being configured to store a link reference to the scanned image data in a centralized data store associated to the particular user (column 2, lines 39-42). Here firmware is interpreted as a memory means in which the relationships of correspondence between identification information on users and the

directories associated with the users are stored. Ogawa further discloses that firmware performing basic input output functions such as causing image transfer by the scanner (column 6, lines 25-30 and Fig.7).

Applicant previously made the argument (remarks page 11) that because the Ogawa discloses "...said file server stores the image data in a directory..."(see column 2, lines 39-40), that the scanning device does not store the image data as claimed. Ogawa discloses that "the image data is input from the scanner" (column 2, lines 39-40). Applicant is advised that this is how networks work. They use servers. Applicants network depicted in Fig.1 uses a server. If image data goes through a communication link it must use a server. In networked applications there is always a client and a server. Applicant is pointed to the specification on page 4 of the disclosure at the definition of Client-Server. In Applicant's Fig. 1, if the client is the imaging client 12, then there must be server. The Sever can be the Web Service Site 36 or it can be within the Communication Link 16 or it can even be the Scanning Device 14. The Server can play any of these roles, but let it be known that a Server is inherent to any networked operation. Therefore when Ogawa inputs the image data from the scanner and stores it by transferring through the server, this clearly reads on having the scanner store the data in a networked environment like the one claimed. This does not in any way differentiate between the presently claimed invention and the reference of Ogawa.

The link reference is interpreted as the user information used to determine the directory associated with the user. A link reference is interpreted as a name or pointer that simply identifies where the file is found and the user ID in Ogawa does that. For

more on how Examiner interprets a link reference refer to the section regarding "link references" at the beginning of the Office Action.

As can best be interpreted from the specification, the present invention claims that the imaging repository consist of a centralized data store wherein links interpreted as file pointers or indexes to imaging data are stored and can be retrieved by outside web services. This is basically what the Internet or any network does in searching for files within a file structure or network.

Ogawa discloses a networked environment with a scanner and a file storage with personal image directories or repositories for storing images associated with a certain users (Fig. 1). This is therefore interpreted as an exchange infrastructure between the imaging data and the remote web services. As discussed above, the first of those web services is making the user directories available to receive newly scanned images. It should also be understood that the purpose of any network is to enable remote access to information and that the access is enabled in both directions and from any client connected to the network given access. This is exceedingly well known in the art with use of the Internet.

As can best be interpreted from the specification, the present invention claims that the imaging repository consist of a centralized data store wherein links interpreted as file pointers or indexes to imaging data are stored and can be retrieved by outside web services. This is basically what the Internet or any network does in searching for files within a file structure or network.

Although Ogawa discloses a networked scanner environment, Ogawa does not explicitly disclose enabling access by The Internet. It should be exceedingly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that any local network, such as the LAN described in Ogawa, may be connected to the internet enabling outside users or services on the World Wide Web to access the LAN and (vice versa) allowing users connected to the LAN to access the World Wide Web. As an example of this the reference of Creamer is cited. Creamer discloses after images are uploaded by a user to a user directory, they can then be accessed by anyone with any kind of access device connected to the Internet (see abstract). The network of Creamer works in the exact same way as both Ogawa and the presently claimed invention. Once a file or data is stored in a directory or a repository and the address of the directory is known and identified (i.e. a link reference that tells the system where the data resides and how to get to it) anyone or anything with permission and an access device may access that information. That's what the Internet is all about. Therefore in view of the remote web access taught by Creamer it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to link the LAN of Ogawa to the internet to enable the images in the personal user directory or repository to be accessed by someone or something some service on the Internet via the world wide web. The motivation for enabling the invention of Ogawa to connect with the Internet is the same motivation that anyone would use any network, to share data.

With regard to claim 2, Ogawa discloses the system as defined in claim 1 wherein said personal imaging repository stores the imaging data in a plurality of file formats (column 9, lines 12-17). Here Ogawa describes a compression/expansion unit within the scanner for preserving the image data usually in the compressed format, but it is apparent that different formats can be used.

With regard to claim 3, Ogawa discloses the system as defined in claim 1 wherein said personal imaging repository comprises an imaging data store assigned to the user for storing imaging data (column 2, lines 30-35). Here Ogawa discloses directories or image stores associated with users.

With regard to claim 4, Ogawa discloses the system as defined in claim 1 wherein said personal imaging repository comprises a plurality of imaging data stores for storing imaging data (column 2, lines 30-35). Here Ogawa discloses that multiple users have their own directories.

With regard to claim 5, Ogawa discloses the system as defined in claim 4 wherein one of said plurality of imaging data stores is assigned to the user for storing imaging data (column 2, lines 30-35). Each user has his/her own directory for storing images.

With regard to claim 6, Ogawa discloses the system as defined in claim 4 wherein one of said plurality of imaging data stores is assigned to a web service for storing imaging data provided by the web service (column 2, lines 55-65). The scanner is connected to a network and through that network is connected to a file server for image storage.

With regard to claim 7, Ogawa discloses the system as defined in claim 1 wherein the centralized data store comprises a composition store for storing imaging compositions of the imaging (column 2, lines 35-45). Here image data is stored in a file server according to the user information.

With regard to claim 8, Ogawa discloses the system as defined in claim 7 wherein said imaging composition comprises a link reference for each imaging data (Figs 4 and 5). Here the image file storage system is disclosed. The image files all have indexes and are considered to operate as link references.

With regard to claim 9, Ogawa discloses the system as defined in claim 1 wherein said personal imaging repository is located on another data storage device that is linked to an imaging client (column 2, lines 55-65).

With regard to claim 21, Ogawa discloses a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program codes

embodied in the medium that when installed in a scanning device linked to a personal

imaging repository with an imaging data store for storing the imaging data and a

composition store for storing imaging compositions with links to the imaging data, the

product causes the scanning device to:

receive scanned imaging data (column 2, lines 30-40);

obtain user information relating to the personal imaging repository (column 2,

lines 30-40);

connect with the imaging data store of the personal imaging repository indicated

from the user information (column 2, lines 30-40); and,

transfer scanned imaging data to the imaging data store (column 2, lines 30–40).

Ogawa discloses where the program causes the computer to transfer a link to a

composition store associated with the user, the composition store being configured to

contain link references to a plurality of image data associated with the user (column 2,

lines 34-42), but does not disclose that the imaging data may be stored in different

imaging data stores on remote devices.   Again the link that is transferred is interpreted

as the User ID corresponding to the file path to get to the associated user file directory.

Ogawa discloses a networked environment with a scanner and a file storage with

personal image directories or repositories for storing images associated with a certain

users (Fig. 1). This is therefore interpreted as an exchange infrastructure between the

imaging data and the remote web services. As discussed above, the first of those web

services is making the user directories available to receive newly scanned images. It

should also be understood that the purpose of any network is to enable remote access

to information and that the access is enabled in both directions and from any client

connected to the network given access. This is exceedingly well known in the art with

use of the Internet.

As can best be interpreted from the specification, the present invention claims

that the imaging repository consist of a centralized data store wherein links interpreted

as file pointers or indexes to imaging data are stored and can be retrieved by outside

web services. This is basically what the Internet or any network does in searching for

files within a file structure or network.

Although Ogawa discloses a networked scanner environment, Ogawa does not

explicitly disclose storing different imaging data stores on remote devices. It should be

exceedingly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that any local network, such as the

LAN described in Ogawa, may be connected to the internet enabling outside users or

services on the World Wide Web to access the LAN and (vice versa) allowing users

connected to the LAN to access the World Wide Web. As an example of this the

reference of Creamer is cited. Creamer discloses after images are uploaded by a user

to a user directory, they can then be accessed by anyone with any kind of access

device connected to the Internet (see abstract). The network of Creamer works in the

exact same way as both Ogawa and the presently claimed invention. Once a file or

data is stored in a directory or a repository and the address of the directory is known

and identified (i.e. a link reference that tells the system where the data resides and how

to get to it) anyone or anything with permission and an access device may access that

information. That's what the Internet is all about. Therefore in view of the remote web

access taught by Creamer it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of invention to link the LAN of Ogawa to the internet to enable the images in

the personal user directory or repository to be stored or accessed by someone or

something some service on the Internet via the world wide web. The motivation for

enabling the invention of Ogawa to connect with the Internet is the same motivation that

anyone would use any network, to share data.

With regard to newly added claim 22, Ogawa discloses a computer program

product comprising readable program codes that when executed causes a scanning

device to perform a method, the method comprising receiving references to a personal

imaging repository of a user *(receiving the reference to the personal imaging repository*

is interpreted as the user ID which is used to pint the images to the corresponding

directory), the references including a data store reference that identifies an imaging data

store for storing scanned image data, and a composition store reference that identifies a

composition store for storing link references to scanned image data associated with the

user (column 2, lines 34-42). The personal imaging repository is the directory in which

the images are stored and the composition store is where the user ID is stored and the

link is the user ID which is used to link to the stored imaging data. The link references

have been discussed repeatedly and the interpretation of link references can be found

at the beginning of the Office Action.

With regard to the references including a data store reference that identifies an

imaging data store for storing scanned image, the references or user ID pointers identify

the imaging store directories in Ogawa so the actual data store or directory files and

structure with file and directory names stored in the directory are interpreted as the data

store reference. With regard to a composition store reference that identifies a

composition store for storing link references to scanned image data associated with the

user, the composition store is interpreted as the memory in Ogawa that stores the

correspondence between user IDs and the directories (column 2, lines 35-40).

So in summary, the data store reference refers to the actual file directory

structure and names. The composition store containing link references refers to the

correspondence information stored in memory. Effectively what is claimed is a file

structure where the image data is to be stored (data store reference information) and a

list of user directories or repositories with corresponding user links or IDs with file paths

or correspondence information.

Ogawa further discloses transferring a scanned image data to the image data

store using the data store reference (column 2, lines 34-42).

Ogawa further discloses obtaining a link reference to the scanned image data

transferred to the image data store (column 2, lines 34-42). The link reference is user

ID correspondence information stored in memory designating the appropriate directory.

Ogawa further discloses causing the link reference to be stored in a composition

store identified by the composition store reference, but does not explicitly disclose

where the composition store can be accessed by a plurality of remote web services to

identify locations of scanned image data associated with the user.

Ogawa discloses a networked environment with a scanner and a file storage with personal image directories or repositories for storing images associated with a certain users (Fig. 1). This is therefore interpreted as an exchange infrastructure between the imaging data and the remote web services. As discussed above, the first of those web services is making the user directories available to receive newly scanned images. It should also be understood that the purpose of any network is to enable remote access to information and that the access is enabled in both directions and from any client connected to the network given access. This is exceedingly well known in the art with use of the Internet.

As can best be interpreted from the specification, the present invention claims that the imaging repository consist of a centralized data store wherein links interpreted as file pointers or indexes to imaging data are stored and can be retrieved by outside web services. This is basically what the Internet or any network does in searching for files within a file structure or network.

Although Ogawa discloses a networked scanner environment, Ogawa does not explicitly disclose storing different imaging data stores on remote devices. It should be exceedingly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that any local network, such as the LAN described in Ogawa, may be connected to the internet enabling outside users or services on the World Wide Web to access the LAN and (vice versa) allowing users connected to the LAN to access the World Wide Web. As an example of this the reference of Creamer is cited. Creamer discloses after images are uploaded by a user to a user directory, they can then be accessed by anyone with any kind of access

device connected to the Internet (see abstract). The network of Creamer works in the

exact same way as both Ogawa and the presently claimed invention. Once a file or

data is stored in a directory or a repository and the address of the directory is known

and identified (i.e. a link reference that tells the system where the data resides and how

to get to it) anyone or anything with permission and an access device may access that

information. That's what the Internet is all about. Therefore in view of the remote web

access taught by Creamer it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of invention to link the LAN of Ogawa to the internet to enable the images in

the personal user directory or repository to be stored or accessed by someone or

something some service on the Internet via the world wide web. It would have been

obvious to store data in multiple remote locations fro the same reasons data is

dispersed throughout the internet, to save space or memory or to speed up processing

time. The motivation for enabling the invention of Ogawa to connect with the Internet is

the same motivation that anyone would use any network, to share data.

With regard to claim 23, the discussion with regard to networked environments of

claims 21 and 22 applies.

10.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

the combination of Ogawa and Creamer and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,182,892 to

Angelo et al.

With regard to claim 10, Ogawa and Creamer dislose the system of claim 1 bur do not explicitly disclose the use of a smart card for obtaining user information. Smart cards are exceedingly well known. Drivers Liscenses, ATM cards, Security access cards are all considered smart cards and all are used to store personal user information. The reference of Angelo teaches the use of a smart card to enable a scanner by authenticating a user meaning the user identification information is held within the smart card. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art a the time of invention to use a smart card to contain user information as taught by Angelo in order to authenticate a user and conduct processing according to a particular user.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wes Tucker whose telephone number is 571-272-7427. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jingge Wu can be reached on 571-272-7429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wes Tucker

2-25-06   BHAVESH M. MEHTA
                              SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
                              TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600